

**REMARKS**

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 13-21 and 24-26 are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 13-21 and 24-26 were objected to due to various informalities. Claims 13 and 26 are amended herein as suggested by the Examiner to address these informalities. These amendments should be entered, even though they are presented after a final Office Action, because they simply address the noted informalities.

Claims 13-21, 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2270130 (Goebels; hereinafter "GB '130") in view of US 6,371,573 (Goebels et al.) and GB 2136521 (Goebels; hereinafter "GB '521"). Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB '130 in view of Goebels et al. and GB '521, and further in view of US 6,264,289 (Franke et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as set forth below.

The Office Action (pg. 5) recognizes that GB '130 does not disclose the following features of claim 13:

wherein the only one additional solenoid control valve is arranged outside a housing accommodating the remaining valve assembly consisting of the two relay valves and the assigned solenoid control valves, and is constructed to be connectable to the remaining valve assembly for supplementing an existing anti-skid control operation by a drive-slip control operation.

Instead, the Office Action refers to GB '521 and asserts that it would have been obvious to combine the disclosure of GB '521 with the teachings of GB '130. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of GB '130 by the teachings of GB '521 to arrange an additional solenoid control valve outside the housing accommodating the remaining valve assembly. For a person of ordinary skill in the art of vehicle brakes, it is unambiguously clear that each of the pressure regulator modules 100 disclosed by GB '130 forms one module entity. As shown in Fig. 4 of GB '130, for example, each of the two pressure regulator modules 100, 100' is a separate entity that contains all of the valves (e.g., 7, 8, 9) within that module. This configuration is illustrated in Fig. 3, which shown valves 7, 8, and 9 contained within the module 100. This interpretation is supported by the specification where the valves are described as "solenoid valves 7, 8, 9, 12 of the valve unit 1 of the pressure-regulating module 100." *Pg. 15, lines 21-22.* This interpretation is further supported by the wording "connections 20, 22 and/or 21, 23" suggesting that the valves 7, 8, 9 of the valve unit 1 are arranged in one common housing (symbolized by the boxes in Figs. 1 to 3) provided with connections on the outside of the housing to external devices. *Pg. 6, line 22 – pg. 7, line 7.* Thus, in GB '130 there is no suggestion to

arrange the additional solenoid control valve outside a housing accommodating the remaining valve assembly.

Furthermore, GB '130 teaches away from such a modification. GB '130 is directed to pressure-regulator modules for braking systems. *See specification at pg. 1.* As described in the reference, "the object of the invention is to produce a pressure-regulator module which when in use will enable the production costs to be reduced noticeably in comparison to the known wheel-related concept by reducing the number of system components required." Since the object of the invention of GB '130 is to reduce the number of components by using modules, arranging an additional solenoid control valve outside of the pressure-regulator module would have rendered the invention of GB '130 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, and thus would not have been obvious. Therefore, claim 13 is patentable over the combined teachings of GB '130, Goebels et al., and GB '521.

Additionally, there is no suggestion that the additional solenoid control valve is "constructed to be connectable to the remaining valve assembly for supplementing an existing anti-skid control operation by a drive-slip control operation," as claimed in claim 13. An advantage of this feature is that a system originally designed just for an anti-skid-control-operation (ABS) functionality can be easily supplemented by a drive-slip control operation (ASR) functionality without changing the original pressure regulator module.

The Office Action acknowledges that GB '130 does not disclose this feature, but asserts that GB '521 discloses it. According to page 1, lines 104 to 107 of GB '521, "[t]hree of these pilot control valves 25 ...are disposed in the housing 2 of the pressure-control valve." The housing according to Fig. 2 consists of just two housing parts 5 and 6. *See, e.g., pg. 1, lines 79-85.* Further, the valve 25 in Fig. 2 and the valves 64, 65 in Fig. 3, respectively, are not designed for or suitable for supplementing an existing control operation by a drive-slip control operation. Thus, the above-mentioned feature of claim 13 is not disclosed or suggested by GB '521. Therefore, claim 13 is patentable over the prior art for this additional reason.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Serial No. 10/524,291  
Amendment Dated: November 7, 2008  
Reply to Office Action: August 21, 2008  
Attorney Docket No. 037068.55856US

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 037068.55856US).

November 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



---

Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169  
Cameron W. Beddard  
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING, LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:CWB:crr  
6486818